

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

ERIC SHIELDS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:08-CV-1079-RWS
	)	
JAMES G. WOODWARD,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the application of Eric Shields for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the application, the Court finds that the applicant is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Additionally, the Court has reviewed the complaint and will dismiss it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because it is legally frivolous.

**28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim

to relief that is plausible on its face.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

### **The Complaint**

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require litigants to formulate their pleadings in an organized and comprehensible manner. Even pro se litigants are obligated to plead specific facts and proper jurisdiction and must abide by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; however, plaintiff has failed to do so in this case. See U.S. v. Wilkes, 20 F.3d 651, 653 (5th Cir. 1994); Boswell v. Honorable Governor of Texas, 138 F.Supp.2d 782, 785 (N.D. Texas 2000); Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2) (complaint should contain “short and plain statement” of claims); Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(e)(2) (each claim shall be “simple, concise, and direct”); Fed.R.Civ.P. 10(b) (parties are to separate their claims within their pleadings “the contents of which shall be limited as far as practicable to a

single set of circumstances"). Although the Court is to give plaintiff's complaint the benefit of a liberal construction, the Court will not create facts or claims that have not been alleged. Plaintiff is required, to the best of his ability, to set out not only his alleged claims in a simple, concise, and direct manner, but also the facts supporting his claims as to each defendant. Because plaintiff has failed to do so, and the instant complaint is nonsensical, the Court will dismiss this action as legally frivolous.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel [Doc. #4] is **DENIED** as moot.

An appropriate order of dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 4th day of August, 2008.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE